

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinhofer (U.S. Pat. No. 6,442,442) in view of Stine (U.S. Pat. No. 6,466,827). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Wienhofer fails to show, teach, or suggest a master computer that clones properties of a first input/output (I/O) device that is connected to a first network including one of attributes, parameters, and operations in order to configure a second I/O device that is subsequently connected to the first network.

As best understood by Applicants, Weinhofer teaches an industrial control system with a programming interface that has a plurality of icons. The icons represent motion commands and relations between the motion commands. A user places the icons in a workspace in a manner to create a desired program that defines the physical relationship between various motion commands. When the icon is placed in the workspace it assumes attributes associated with a particular class of icons to which the icon belongs. The attributes of the icon must be subsequently modified in order to configure the motion commands for a specific application. Applicants can find no

mention of cloning a first I/O device that is already connected to a first network in order to clone a second I/O device that is subsequently connected to the first network.

Stine fails to cure the deficient teachings of Weinhofer. As best understood by Applicants, Stine teaches an industrial control system for controlling I/O devices. The industrial control system has relay ladder objects that are prestored in memory. The prestored relay ladder objects are associated with a particular I/O device. A programmable logic controller is preconfigured with a standard set of relay ladder objects with sufficient extra relay ladder objects to accommodate most programming applications for a specific industry. A mapper section is used to connect the prestored relay ladder objects to addresses associated with the I/O device. Stine at best discloses cloning a first I/O device in order to generate a second I/O device. However, the first I/O device is not already connected to a first network and the second I/O device is not subsequently connected to the first network. Therefore, Stine fails to disclose a master computer that clones properties of a first input/output (I/O) device that is connected to a first network including one of attributes, parameters, and operations in order to configure a second I/O device that is subsequently connected to the first network. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 is allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-9 and 11-20 each ultimately depend on claims 1 and 10 respectively and are allowable for at least similar reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/21/05

By: Michael D. Wiggins
Michael D. Wiggins
Reg. No. 34,754

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600